

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Mekiel Mitchell, #232904,	)	C.A. No. 3:06-0054-TLW-JRM
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Colie Rushton, Warden of McCormick	)	
Correctional Institutional; and Henry McMaster,	)	
Attorney General of the State of South Carolina,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

---

The petitioner, an inmate at the South Carolina Department of Corrections, seeks *habeas corpus* relief under Title 28, United States Code, Section 2254. (Doc. # 1). The respondents filed a return and motion for summary judgment on May 11, 2006. (Docs. # 13 & 14). As petitioner was *pro se* at that time, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975), the petitioner was advised by Order filed May 24, 2006, that he had thirty-four (34) days to file any material in opposition to the motion for summary judgement. (Doc. # 16). On August 29, 2006, petitioner filed, through counsel, a written opposition to respondents' motion for summary judgement. (Doc. # 21).

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge McCrorey recommends that the respondents' motion for summary judgment be granted, and that this petition be dismissed without an evidentiary hearing. (Doc. # 28). Petitioner has filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 36).

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 28), petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 36); and respondents' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 14) and the petition is dismissed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
TERRY L. WOOTEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

March 15, 2007  
Florence, South Carolina